Premera Blue Cross Public Meeting

		Page 1
1	WASHINGTON STATE INSURANCE COMMISSION	
2		
3	PUBLIC MEETING	
4	IN THE MATTER OF	
5	THE PROPOSED CONVERSION OF PREMERA BLUE CROSS	
6	TO A FOR-PROFIT CORPORATION	
7		
8	October 8, 2002	
9	at	
10	Red Lion Inn	
11	802 George Washington Way	
12	Richland, Washington	
13		
14		
15		
16	Taken Before:	
17	SUE E. GARCIA, CCR, RPR	
	Certified Court Reporter	
18	of	
	CAPITOL PACIFIC REPORTING	
19	2401 Bristol Court S.W.	
	Olympia, WA 98502	
20	360.352.2054	
	e-mail: capitolpacific@atg.com	
21	www.capitolpacificreporter.com	
22		
23		
24		
25		

Premera Blue Cross Public Meeting

		Page 2
1	I N D E X	_
2		PAGE
3	Mike Kreidler - Insurance Commissioner 3,11,22,4	
4	Jim Odiorne - Assistant Insurance Commissioner	4
5	Rusty Fallis - Assistant Attorney General	7
6	Gubby Barlow - CEO Premera Blue Cross	12
7	Yori Milo - Premera Blue Cross Executive VP	18
8		
	Public Comment	
9		
-	Mr. Lynn Hall	26
10	Mr. Harry Geher	28
	Ms. Velma Jarrett	30
11	Ms. Brooke DuBois	31
	Dr. John Gollhofer	32
12	Mr. John Vornbrock	34
	Dr. John Staeheli	35
13	Dr. Kenneth Isaacs	37
	Dr. David Merkley	42
14	Mr. Michael Cafferky	43
	Mr. John Putz	45
15	Dr. Leo Greenawalt	48
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Page 3 1 PROCEEDINGS (Tuesday, October 8, 2002, at 7:05 p.m.) 3 4 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Good evening. I'm Mike 5 Kreidler, and I'm the Washington State Insurance 6 Commissioner. And joining me this evening is the 7 Assistant Attorney General Rusty Fallis, who sits to my 8 left, and to my right Deputy Insurance Commissioner Jim Odiorne. Thank you very much for coming tonight and participating in this process. 10 11 The reason we're here is because on May 30 Premera 12 Blue Cross presented a proposal or the intent to submit a proposal to convert from nonprofit to for-profit, and 13 14 that is a part of a conversion of that company. 15 Ultimately, I'm going to have to act as a judge in this process and decide the impact of this application on 16 17 the consumers of the State of Washington. However, tonight I'll refrain from talking about the merits of the 18 19 proposed conversion. Our primary concerns with the 20 application are, number one, that consumers are not 21 harmed by a conversion; number two, the potential effect 22 on Premera's solvency; and three, obtaining an accurate valuation of Premera's assets. 23 24 This evening it is critical that we hear from the 25 public early in the review process. That's why we're

Page 4

here this evening. We'll work hard to keep our presentations to a minimum so that we can hear from you.

We're going to start off with the presentation by
Deputy Insurance Commissioner Odiorne, who will speak for
ten minutes, followed by Assistant Attorney General
Fallis, who will speak for ten minutes. And following
these two gentlemen, we'll have an opportunity to hear
for 15 minutes from Premera Blue Cross to describe their
conversion proposal. Then the most important part of
this evening is to hear from you early in this process.

At this point I'm going to turn it over to Deputy
Insurance Commissioner Odiorne to outline our -- the
Insurance Commissioner's role in this.

MR. ODIORNE: Thank you, Commissioner. Good evening. We're glad that you could all be here. As the Commissioner indicated, it's very important that he hears from you about your position on this transaction.

As the Commissioner indicated, Premera did file with us what is known in the regulatory framework as a Form A filing. That notice indicates that there will be a change in control over a regulated entity, and whenever as much as 10 percent of a company changes control, the Form A must be filed for our review and approval. On average, we do two or three Form A's each year. This is probably the largest, most complex one since the -- or

the Farmers Group was sold several years ago.

Within the Premera filing are a number of different types of filings. There will be new companies formed. There will be changes of control of -- changes of control of for-profit companies. There will be a change from nonprofit to for-profit. Included will be a number of intercompany agreements that, under the Holding Company Act, must be approved before they can be entered into. And each of those transactions must be evaluated individually and as they affect the entire transaction.

The Commissioner's primary authority is the Holding Company Act. That's Chapter 48.31C in the insurance code. Under the act, a change of control requires a formal hearing, and the Commissioner will act as the judge in that.

And because of that, as he indicated, we must limit some contact. We have within the Commissioner's office developed what's sometimes referred to as the Chinese Wall, where some people who are on one side of it and can talk to the Commissioner, and others are on the other side of it, and we can't talk to him about this transaction. We will, in the end, make a recommendation to him after we've reviewed all of the information.

We have engaged a number of assistants to help us in that review. We have professionals in the areas of

Page 6

investment banking, actuarial analysis, accounting and tax, and legal analysis. We've identified the apparent successful bidders in those areas, and each of those apparent successful bidders has been involved in a conversion in at least one other state. We will work very closely with those consultants in developing our recommendation for the Commissioner. We expect those consultants to develop an executive summary, which will be made public prior to the time of the final formal hearing.

We early on developed a time frame that indicated we would complete the process before the end of December of this year. That won't happen. We haven't been able to get the contracts with the consultants in place yet, so that's pushed everything back two or three weeks at least. Whatever happens with the consultants, we're not going to make a recommendation to the Commissioner or ask that a formal hearing be set until we're sure that we've had all the information we can get and have had an opportunity to fully evaluate that information.

It's our intention, to the extent that it's legally possible, to make everything publicly available.

Currently on our Web site is the formal filing that's public. I believe we now have the transcript from our first meeting such as this, which was held in Seattle.

There will be prefiled testimony, and that will go on the Web site. So the Web site will be an ideal place for you to find where the status of the transaction is and what's come in so far. There's also a place on the web site for you to make additional comments if you choose.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Mr. Odiorne.

And now I would like to turn to Assistant Attorney

General Fallis.

MR. FALLIS: Thank you, Commissioner Kreidler.

On behalf of Attorney General Gregoire, I want to extend her sincere regrets at not being able to be here tonight. She very much had hoped to be able to attend the forum, but she was called out of town to participate with some other state attorneys general in negotiations on some pending multistate litigation, and it just became impossible for her to be here.

I'm going to spend just a few minutes describing the various roles that the Office of the Attorney General will play in connection with the review of the proposed conversion. There are three primary roles that this office will play. They won't necessarily occur in sequence and, in fact, for the most part, to one degree or another, these will all be going on at the same time.

One role will be to serve as the legal advisor to

Page 8

the Office of the Insurance Commissioner as it performs its functions in reviewing the proposed conversion. As is the case with other state agencies, the Commissioner's office receives legal counsel and litigation support from the Attorney General's Office.

We have attorneys on our staff who are available to advise Commissioner Kreidler in his role as the final decision-maker on those things within his purview. We have other lawyers on staff who will be available to assist the review team that Deputy Commissioner Odiorne referred to. This bifurcation of our legal staff parallels the staff structure that the Commissioner's office has established. And it reflects the requirement in the State Administrative Procedure Act that the final decision-maker in an adjudicative hearing and that person's lawyers be different from the agency staff members and lawyers who serve as parties and advocates in the adjudicative hearing.

A second role that the Attorney General's Office will play will be to review potential antitrust issues and anticompetitive effects of the proposed conversion. The Insurance Holding Company Act specifically calls for the Attorney General's Office and the Commissioner's Office to confer on these issues.

The antitrust division in the Attorney General's

Page 9

Office will review the proposed conversion and make its findings and concerns, if any, known to the review team. It's possible that the Attorney General's antitrust division will seek formally to intervene as a party in the adjudicative hearing. Whether it does so or not is up to it and will depend on what those lawyers conclude.

But I mention it because it's possible that, as this review process unfolds, you may see one lawyer from the Attorney General's Office advising Commissioner Kreidler, a different lawyer advising the review team, and yet a different lawyer addressing antitrust issues in the adjudicative hearing.

The third primary role that my office will play will be to review what I'll call the foundation-related issues. Premera's proposed conversion involves, among other things, a dissolution of some nonprofit corporations, the creation of some new nonprofit corporations, including some charitable corporations, and the endowment of those charitable organizations with funds for the purpose of carrying out certain healthcare-related initiatives.

Under the Washington Nonprofit Corporation Act, where there is a proposal to dissolve a nonprofit corporation and that corporation holds assets which by law can be used only for charitable or similar public

Page 10

purposes, the Attorney General must approve a plan for the dissolution of that corporation. The act goes on to say that those assets, in effect, must be preserved and held by a nonprofit entity which is to carry on the same or similar purpose as those carried out by the dissolving corporation.

In this instance, what this means is that those assets of the conversion that involve the dissolution of these nonprofit corporations and the endowment of new charitable organizations require the approval of the Attorney General's Office. In this regard, our review will focus on two primary subject areas. One is the valuation of assets, or put another way, making sure that the size of the endowment that is to be placed with the charitable organization is appropriate.

The second major area of focus will be the nature and structure of the charitable organizations. As I mentioned, the Nonprofit Corporation Act, and indeed, the common law of charitable trusts, requires that the successor entity carry on the same or similar purposes as those carried on by the corporation to be dissolved.

What this means is that we will be looking at the mission statement, the articles and bylaws, and the governance structures of these new organizations to make sure that they are truly independent of the for-profit

entities to be created and are, therefore, capable of carrying out of the public-benefit services that the law requires them to carry out. In a nutshell, that covers the three primary functions that my office will be performing.

I do want to mention one logistical item. The Attorney General's Office has established a citizen comment phone line through which any person can leave a message for us with concerns or comments about the proposed conversion. I'll read that number now, and if you don't have a pencil or you want to talk to me afterwards and get the number again, you can do so. It will also be posted on the Attorney General's Web site, which is www.atg.wa.gov. The phone number is (360) 586-8813, and this is a number you can call 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and leave a message. Through the Web site you can also send an e-mail message if you'd rather do that than leave a phone message.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Assistant Attorney General Fallis.

I want to point out that the Attorney General -- and I truly -- it's unfortunate she couldn't be here tonight. I know how much she wished she could be here, too, but important business did take her elsewhere. We did a

joint hearing together in Seattle. Unfortunately, last 1 Wednesday when we were in Spokane and tonight, unfortunately, she's out of town and unable to participate.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But what it does point to is the close collaborative working relationship that we have between the Attorney General's Office and the Insurance Commissioner's Office. We're in the process right now of finalizing an agreement just exactly of who covers what and how, and how we work together. That will be shortly posted on, probably, both Web sites, through the Attorney General's Office and the Office of the Insurance Commissioner. But it is a very close working relationship that is -- we're very consistent, with the kind of task that we have in front of us, to do it in the best interests of the people of the State of Washington.

I'd like to now call on Premera's CEO, Mr. Gubby Barlow, who will then also have Mr. Yori Milo make a presentation.

MR. BARLOW: Good evening, Commissioner Kreidler, Deputy Insurance Commissioner Odiorne, Assistant Attorney General Fallis. Thank you for this opportunity to discuss our proposal to raise capital in the public markets.

In the four months since we announced our proposal

last spring, many people have shared with me their support and also their concerns. People ask me, "Why does Premera want to convert? Will Premera focus on Wall Street instead of its members? Will being for-profit cause premiums to rise or squeeze payments to physicians and hospitals? Will Premera executives get huge success bonuses when the company converts? Will you remain in rural areas of the state? Does Premera want to be taken over by an out-of-state insurer? And if not, how will you prevent it?"

I've also seen great interest in our proposal to dedicate 100 percent of the initial stock to health initiatives in Washington and Alaska. Many people have strong opinions about how those funds should be spent, who should control the charities, and some are concerned about an accurate valuation of the company.

These are important questions. They deserve thorough public discussion. I am confident we can address them all.

A bit about our company. Premera Blue Cross is an nonprofit Washington corporation, one of the largest private companies in Washington, with 3,000 employees serving over 1.4 million people in three states. Our roots go back to 1933 in Washington, 1977 in Alaska, and 1994 in Oregon. This year we're starting a new affiliate

1 in Arizona.

So what is Premera trying to achieve as a business?

I believe people buy health insurance for one primary reason: peace of mind. And that's our mission, providing peace of mind to our members about their healthcare coverage. For us, delivering on that mission means being financially stable; providing broad choices of products, physicians and hospitals; providing excellent service; and supporting growth. Growth not only responds to customer needs, it spreads our operating costs over a large base to the benefit of all of our members.

And because healthcare is local, we believe we can best serve our members as an independent,

Washington-based company. This has been our strategy.

It remains our strategy, whether we are nonprofit or for-profit.

So why do we want to convert? Of course, going public creates more resources to accomplish our mission. This is a highly capital-intensive business. We need capital to maintain insurance reserves, to invest in new technologies and products, and to serve more members.

As a nonprofit, our sources of capital are effectively limited to our operating profits. Those operating margins are slim, last year about 1 percent of each premium dollar. We have explored other alternative

Page 15

sources of capital, but have rejected them. For example, another nonprofit Washington health plan explored merging last year with a large plan in Chicago. That isn't an option that is consistent with Premera's desire to remain independent and headquartered right here in Washington.

I'd like to address some of those concerns I have heard. As for the influence of Wall Street, any company that focuses on shareholders first and its customers and other stakeholders second is doomed to fail on both fronts. Our mission and dedication to our members remains the same, whether we are for-profit or operate as a public company.

Second, going public will not increase premiums or reduce fees for physicians and other providers. Today we operate in a very competitive market, competing with for-profit and nonprofits alike. We charge our customers the market price. And we pay our physicians and hospitals what the market demands. Clearly, these market forces are independent of and unaffected by our capital structure. In fact, Premera has increased our standard rates for Eastern Washington physicians by more than 20 percent since January 2000.

Third, some conversions elsewhere have involved large success bonuses for executives. There will be no bonuses if Premera converts. In the future, stock

Page 16

ownership plans may be offered to certain of our employees, but our board has yet to address this issue. And we will submit any such plan to State officials before you make a decision on our conversion.

Fourth, with some conversions in other states, there have been debates over the value of the companies. By dedicating 100 percent of the initial stock outright, the full worth of the company, including goodwill, is going to support health initiatives. The stock market, which is the most efficient and effective arbiter of value that we know of, will determine the value of that stock.

Five, there are no plans to sell this company, and we remain committed to rural areas. Premera has an independent board of respected community, medical, and business leaders. Our board has repeatedly determined that we remain independent and based in Washington, because that is how we can serve our members best.

That's why our conversion plan incorporates all antitakeover provisions available under Washington law. Further, the State's Holding Company Act provides additional protections. In the unlikely event that our board determined to sell, the Insurance Commissioner would be required to scrutinize any proposed sale with the same due diligence as a conversion.

As for our commitment to rural areas, our record

speaks for itself. Premera's family of companies currently serves every Washington county. We have remained in many counties after other nonprofit and for-profit insurers have pulled out. Where we have stopped selling products in the past, it has been after very careful consideration. For example, we stopped selling Medicare Plus Choice. We did this because federal funding was inadequate to cover all costs including fees acceptable to physicians and hospitals.

We believe that strategically, a statewide network of physicians and hospitals and a statewide presence, including our rural areas, is a valuable competitive advantage that we wish to maintain into the future.

In summary, I believe this conversion produces three great wins. It's a win for our members through increased capital to serve them better. It's a win for the State through a growing company supporting local employment and the tax base. And it's a win for the people of Washington and Alaska through the creation of a substantial pool of funds devoted to health initiatives.

Thank you very much. Yori Milo, one of our executive officers, will add some detail about our proposal.

24 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Mr. Milo?

MR. MILO: Thank you.

Page 18

Mr. Barlow explained why Premera seeks to reorganize as a stock company, that is, to access capital. I'm going to be talking more specifically about what Premera's proposed to do as contained in its Form A filing that's on record with the Insurance Commissioner; that is, how we propose to reorganize into a stock company and, also, how we propose to establish the charitable organizations to support the health initiatives that Mr. Barlow described.

To do that, what I would like to do is look at the Premera family of companies as it's organized today, and then take a look at the Premera family of companies as it would look after a conversion. So to start on the screen -- and on the podium we've handed out hard copies -- is the current family of companies in Premera.

The green companies represent nonprofit organizations. The blue companies represent for-profit organizations. So you can see that, today, Premera's a mix of both for-profit and nonprofit companies. For example, Premera Blue Cross is a health insurance company that provides healthcare coverage in Alaska and Washington. It is a nonprofit company; has been since its inception.

By contrast LifeWise of Oregon, shown on the bottom right of the screen, is a for-profit company also

providing health insurance coverage; has been a for-profit since its inception. Similarly, States West Life Insurance, shown on the left side is also a for-profit company; it sells life is disability insurance in Washington, Alaska, and Oregon, and a number of other states.

So that brings that question: What is the difference between for-profit and nonprofit companies, and what are some of the similarities between for-profits and Premera today? Key difference, for profits have shareholders. Stock owners obtain their shares by paying money to the corporation. That money serves as the capital for our operations and reserves. In Premera's case as a nonprofit, as you can see, it has no stockholders and, therefore, has no ability to sell stock to generate capital.

While there are differences between for profits and nonprofits, there are also similarities. In the case of Premera, contrary to common misperception, Premera is not a tax-exempt charitable organization. It pays taxes, both federal and state. In 2001 it paid over \$37 million to the State of Washington, the same amount it would have paid had it been operating that year as a for-profit company. Similarly in 2001, it paid federal taxes in excess of \$10 million. And of course, with respect to

Page 20

for-profit and nonprofit regulation, Premera as a for-profit or nonprofit would be regulated in the insurance business in the same way, under the insurance code and subject to the jurisdiction of the Office of the Insurance Commissioner.

Let's take a look at Premera as it would be reorganized pursuant to the conversion as filed with the Office of the Insurance Commissioner. As you can see, the organizations shown in blue, the same family of companies, but now operating in for-profit status pursuant to a series of transactions, which are contemplated and provided for in the Form A, and which are subject to the approval of the Insurance Commissioner and the Attorney General.

On the screen you also see some new organizations shown in green. These are the charitable organizations that are established to help create the charitable endowment that Mr. Barlow described. The way this would be done is 100 percent of New Premera stock would be contributed, given, to a charitable foundation, the foundation shareholder at the top of the screen. The purposes of the foundation shareholder would be to hold and sell the stock and to assure that the proceeds are used to support Washington and Alaska health initiatives.

That would be done by giving the cash proceeds of

Page 21

the sale of stock to two new charitable organizations, one established for Washington, one established for Alaska, as shown on the left of the chart at the top, with the proceeds being distributed pursuant to an allocation to be agreed to by the states of Alaska and Washington as part of the conversion decision.

These two new charitable organizations which would hold the proceeds of the stock, the cash generated from the stock sale, would be completely independent of Premera, the Premera management and board would have no role on the board or management of the two new charitable organizations, and there would be no contractual relationship tying New Premera with these two new charitable organizations.

As part of our Form A filing, we have proposed some purposes for these charitable organizations; for example, to address unmet healthcare needs of uninsured populations in the states, the education of physicians nurses and other caregivers to help serve underserved areas, and generally to create a legacy endowment to improve healthcare in local communities of these states.

Our Form A filing also recognizes that State officials will have a role in deciding how these charities are established, for what purposes they're established. And in our Form A filing, we call on State

officials to seek community input on what the final purposes of these organizations should be.

Now, I've talked about the charitable organizations, and Mr. Barlow said at the outset, the purposes of the reorganization, the conversion, is to enable Premera to raise capital to fund its operations and reserves. And that would be done by selling new shares into the public markets, that is the stock market, for cash consideration, which would fund Premera's cash needs.

With that, we'd like to thank the Office the Insurance Commissioner and the Office of the Attorney General for giving us this opportunity to present our proposal. And that closes our presentation.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Mr. Milo, and thank you, Mr. Barlow, for your presentation.

Now we have an opportunity to hear from the public, and let me just outline a few of the rules for how we need to conduct this portion of the meeting. First, I would like to -- when I call your name, I would like to have you to come up and take a seat here in front of me.

We have a five-minute time limit, and the purpose of that will be to make sure that everybody has an opportunity to speak. We have a timekeeper over here who will notify you if you're getting close on your time.

Again the purpose is to ensure that everybody who wishes

to come is afforded that opportunity.

For the sake of having an accurate record of this meeting, we are having it transcribed this evening, and that transcription of this meeting will be posted on our Web site. The meeting that was conducted a week ago yesterday in Seattle, that transcript has already been posted on our Insurance Commissioner's Web site so that you could -- so that we can make that part of the official record.

I would urge you to speak slowly since it is being transcribed, to afford an opportunity to make sure that we get everything accurate. Second, I would ask you to, when you come up, to state your name and any organization that you may represent. For your last name, if you would be kind enough just to spell your last name, it helps a great deal with the transcription.

If you are reading from a specific text, I would ask that if it's going to be more than the allotted time, that you perhaps summarize. And you can also present to the timekeeper over here any document that you may want to enter that is already prepared, written.

I would like to point out, too, that this is a round of hearings that we're conducting. It's the third of four hearings around the State of Washington, and they are being done purposely early in the process to solicit

public comment on the proposal of the conversion by Premera Blue Cross.

I would anticipate that we will have another round of hearings once we have the expert information that Mr. Odiorne described to you, from the experts that have been retained by our office, and these experts have extensive experience in other states that have gone through conversion processes. Once that information is available, it will be posted, again, on our Web site, and it will be -- we'll have before us another round of public hearings.

Doing an early round of public hearings is somewhat unique. In the other states, they have not done it this early. I felt, because I've certainly seen that this has not always been a harmonious discussion about a conversion, to begin the process very early to solicit public comments so the public has an opportunity to offer their views. So we're actually moving ahead of what other states have done, from the standpoint of having so many public hearings and having them very early in the process.

This evening, as I mentioned earlier, I will not be prepared to answer questions, engage in rebuttals or debate. I -- we have many questions of our own. Your questions will be included in the record and will be

Page 25

certainly considered as a part of the review process that we're undertaking, before I have the decision to make as to whether we go forward with and approve or not approve the proposal that Premera has put before us.

At some point we will have a formal hearing that will be for the record, where we will have the chance to lead up to the formal decision as to what action we will take in that regard and, again, it will be done at that point in a very close collaborative working relationship with the joint responsibility that we have through the Office of the Insurance Commissioner and the Office of the Attorney General.

I now would like to call on the first person who signed up indicating -- and they have a question mark, but I want to afford them an opportunity, if they want, to come forward to testify. And the first person on here is John Putz. Do you want to come up, John, or do you want to wait?

MR. PUTZ: I'll wait.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Wait a bit.

Let me call, then, on Lynn Hall. Again, if you could spell your last name and then speak slowly for the transcriptionist.

MR. HALL: My name is Lynn Hall, H-a-l-l, last name. And I appreciate the opportunity to come here this

evening and say a few things.

I don't know a lot about this process other than what I've read in the paper. I haven't received anything in the mail concerning it or any other things. The thing that angers me just a little bit and brings me here tonight is because I just received in the mail an increase in my premium for MSC Premera. And that increase is a 55-percent increase over last year. And over the last two years, it amounts to about an 81-percent increase, which is a tremendous increase.

Now, I can understand, as I listen here tonight, that it says here the consumer's not harmed. I'm being harmed. My wife and I own a small business, and we can't afford these increases. It say there's a potential effect on Premera's solvency. Darn right. They're getting solvent because of these types of increases. I can understand that insurance all over the United States is going up, but I think that it's pretty hard to justify an 81-percent increase over the last two years. So I'm concerned about that.

An accurate evaluation of Premera's assets? If you go up that much, it increases with everybody, all their constituents, all of their people who belong to Premera Blue Cross, certainly that's going to jack up their valuation of their assets and make them look a lot more

healthier and more attractive out there in the public marketplace.

If Mr. Barlow and Mr. Milo can verify that they will benefit in no way materially from this going private, then I would say maybe there's something to it. But I don't think either one of them can say that they will not benefit materially at all from this going private with MSC Premera.

Other thing I'm a little bit angry about is because of your predecessor, or the fact that the insurance in this state is pretty darn hard to come by. We had to work really hard to get insurance. We would like to keep it. It blesses and benefits our family. We want to be able to keep having health insurance, but if this keeps up, we can't afford it. We're a small business, and we want to stay in business. And we just can't afford it if those kinds of increases keep going up.

So those are my concerns. I don't have any questions per se other than just to state my concerns. Thank you, sir.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much, Mr. Hall.

I would like to call on Harvey Geher. Excuse me.

Harry Geher.

MR. GEHER: Yes, that's right.

Page 28 1 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: I'll put my glasses on next time. MR. GEHER: I'll put my Twins cap on. 3 4 Thank you very much for this opportunity, 5 meeting in Richland, and giving me the opportunity to say 6 a few words. My name is Harry Geher. I'm the 7 administrator at Othello Community Hospital at Othello, 8 Washington. First, at our hospital we generate on a gross-revenue basis per year of approximately \$2 million 10 11 in billing to Premera Blue Cross. And we have a 12 35-percent discount on our inpatient charges, and we also incur a 15-percent discount on our outpatient charges 13 from Premera. So on an annual basis, if we are grossing 14 15 approximately \$2 million in discounts, approximately \$500,000 per year. 16 17 In the state of small rural hospitals such as ours, we only have 49 beds in a community of 6,000. 18 19 financial status of small rural hospitals in this state is very precarious at this particular point in time. 20 21 Hospitals are -- as hospitals in this entire state, 22 compared to small hospitals in other states in this country, we're severely unpaid through Medicare, Medicaid 23 24 programs, and we are just incurring a lot of stress and 25 challenges in just maintaining our own financial solvency

with continuing access and availability to people who live in our communities.

Othello is particularly in need. It's a rather poor community; 45 to 50 percent of our revenue base is derived from Medicaid, another 20 percent is derived from Medicare. Primary is our No. 1 nongovernmental payer, so our first concern is related to what will happen in the future if Premera converts from nonprofit to for-profit, will the discounts for small rural hospitals increase?

Second concern, we too are an employer, and we provide medical insurance coverage to our employees year in and year out. We're only able to receive quotes from two companies: One quote is from Premera; one is from another competitor.

Also on a yearly basis, some years we too have incurred price increases of 40, 50 percent in the premiums that we pay to insure our people. But I think from year in, year out, approximately 20 percent a year.

So second concern is if Premera converts from nonprofit to for-profit and has a loyalty to provide dividends to the shareholders year in and year out, what will happen to the premium increases we will feel as an employer?

Third consideration is probably a broader issue related to the State's -- burgeoning State deficit.

We've received some materials that indicate the conversion fees that Blue Cross has incurred converting from nonprofit to for-profit, in either indirect or direct fashion, has been utilized in the state of New York and are certainly being considered by the governor of Michigan to help fill their budget holes. So that's an indirect -- that kind of consideration also concerns us as to whether or not the conversion fees will be 100 percent reserved for preserving healthcare access and availability to all Washingtonians.

Those are my comments this evening, and I thank you once again for this opportunity.

13 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much,
14 Mr. Geher.

Velma Jarrett? Velma Jarrett? If I've mispronounced your name, I apologize.

MS. JARRETT: Thank you very much for allowing me to come tonight. My name is Velma Jarrett,

J-a-r-r-e-t-t. And I am here tonight to represent various individuals who have Premera Blue Cross.

I have received numerous phone calls, as an appointee to represent Premera Blue Cross from various policyholders, asking what effect this particular thing has upon their policy premiums. They seem to be very concerned that if Premera Blue Cross becomes a for-profit

	Page 31
1	company, that it will impact their premiums considerably.
2	And they already have received various increases, that
3	they feel that it's very difficult for them to pay their
4	premiums.
5	So I primarily am here to learn more about it so
6	that I know how to answer their questions, because there
7	is a real concern among our seniors who are on fixed
8	incomes as to how they're going to be able to pay their
9	premiums.
10	Thank you very much.
11	COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much for
12	coming this evening.
13	I believe it's Brooke DuBois? DuBois?
14	MS. DuBOIS: I had a "no" there.
15	COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Okay.
16	MS. DuBOIS: But since you called me, I'll
17	come.
18	COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Oh, you did. I don't
19	know why
20	MS. DuBOIS: Why did you call me up?
21	COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Well, there was a
22	question mark there, that's why.
23	MS. DuBOIS: I'm Brooke DuBois, D-u-B-o-i-s,
24	and I am the director of the Ben Franklin Community
25	Health Alliance.

But I -- my question has to do with the creation of the charitable trusts, and this is a self-serving question. And I'm really sorry, but we are a nonprofit too. We were trying to hit up MSC for money for a while; we don't get any.

And I'm wondering once this charitable institution is created, does that money then go to other nonprofits who are working on healthcare issues in the communities, or does it -- is it distributed as Kellogg and Johnson foundations and so on would be, to initiatives that you create?

And that's it. And I wouldn't have said that had you not called me.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: There was a question mark after "no." So, see, the door was left open.

MS. DuBOIS: I was leaving my options open.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Okay. Like to call on

John Gollhofer?

DR. GOLLHOFER: Good evening. I'm John
Gollhofer, G-o-l-l-h-o-f-e-r. I'm a physician in
Spokane. I'm a Premera provider. May family and I are
Premera subscribers. I'm here tonight to speak in favor
of the Premera conversion. I've practiced medicine for
25 years, delivered thousands of babies. I'm a past
president of the Spokane County Medical Society and past

president of the Washington State Medical Association.

I've been an outspoken critic of insurance companies.

Recently I've been asked to share my expertise and my criticism by being a member of the board of directors of Premera. They've asked me to tell it like it is, and they haven't been disappointed. Based on my experience, I believe that I'm well-qualified, if not uniquely qualified, to speak on the issues of healthcare delivery in the State of Washington.

We have significant issues, issues of the uninsured, the underinsured, the state and federal underfunding of healthcare promises. We have physician practice closures. We are unable to recruit physicians. We are unable to retain the physicians that we have.

The private insurance companies are the only element that is holding the healthcare financing system together. Those of us who lived through the collapse of the Unified Physicians of Washington, the receivership of the Kitsap Physician Service, and the bankruptcy of Spokane Health Link understand how important it is to have financially strong insurance companies.

I believe the for-profit conversion of Premera will be good for the patients and the providers in the State of Washington. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much

1 Doctor.

John Vornbrock?

MR. VORNBROCK: It's a pleasure to be here, Mr. Insurance Commissioner, gentlemen. Thank you for holding this hearing.

My name is John Vornbrock, V-o-r-n-b-r-o-c-k. And I'm chief operating financial officer with Yakima Valley Memorial Hospital. I'm here tonight not to speak either for or against the conversion, but merely to raise some concerns. Our hospital board has not taken a formal position, that's why I'm not going to offer a formal position for our hospital.

I know there's a number of issues dealing with the conversion. I would like to speak to one of those issues this evening. This relates to our experience that our facilities had with Premera Blue Cross. During the last five years, we have had difficulty getting payment increases on a timely basis through Premera Blue Cross. This has taken months in the last two situations.

This is in contrast to our payers that we deal with.

There are only a few major payers in the Yakima area.

Those payers are very critical to us because of the large amount of Medicare and Medicaid that we have in Yakima.

So that has been a concern.

I might mention that we have eventually gotten

Page 35

increases, and they have been adequate. But it has taken a period of time. We are concerned on how Premera will be able to compete in the consumer marketplace, provide a return for its shareholders, and also compensate providers in a fair and appropriate way in the future after the conversion.

The one comment regarding -- regarding Premera's impact in our marketplace, since Premera is our largest payer, it really -- Mr. Barlow indicated that Premera will pay what the market demands, but I think Premera really is in a position to shape that market due to its very size. So I think that does need to be taken into consideration.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak tonight.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much.

John Staeheli?

MR. STAEHELI: My name's John Staeheli,
S-t-a-e-h-e-l-i. I'm a physician. I'm also a Premera
provider and subscriber. I didn't come tonight with any
prepared statement. I am not pro or con. I came more
for education and to make sure that some of the concerns
that have been already raised tonight are being raised,
but maybe some other ones.

I think the State needs to be careful. They're

Page 36

being offered a bribe, perhaps, for a conversion. A lot of money out there. And you got to do the right thing with it if you choose to accept it.

What's the purpose of insurance? Insurance, as I understand it, is a collective to help insure, take care of us in times of need. It's nice to have companies that are profitable. But what's that profit then for? I think it's to go back into the system for what it's designed to do, not to go into other lines of business. And I think that we need to be cognizant of that with healthcare.

The premiums that we pay each month are designed to go into our healthcare system to keep it afloat, to allow hospitals to reinvest in new technology, not for insurance companies to take the profit and go elsewhere. So I think we have to keep that in mind.

If we look at what was published in the paper today about where the premium dollar goes and where it's spent on medical care, in '97, MSC's premium, 88 percent went to medical care. This last year, 84 percent; their profit went up, but they're spending less of their premium dollars on medical care. If we look at for-profit companies, the percentage that they spend of their premium dollar that goes back into healthcare services is down in the 70s. Where is that? That's a

Page 37 1 loss to the system, ultimately. I think we have to be careful of that. That's all. Thank you. 4 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much, 5 Doctor. 6 Ken Isaacs? 7 MR. ISAACS: Good evening, Commissioner 8 Kreidler and Rusty Fallis from the Attorney General's Office, there, and staff. My name is Dr. Kenneth Isaacs. I'm the first 10 11 vice-president of the Washington State Medical 12 Association. That is I-s-a-a-c-s. 13 The WSMA represents over 8,800 physicians and 14 surgeons in our state. I am a neurologist myself, having 15 been in practice in Walla Walla for 21 years. 16 Commissioner Kreidler, we at the WSMA have appreciated 17 the recent opportunities to work with you seeking solutions to benefit the people of Washington regarding 18 19 the challenging and complex issues of health insurance. Similarly, from the Attorney General's Office, I 20 21 would certainly like to personally acknowledge and thank 22 the work that has been done and the extraordinary and historic work and contributions to benefit the health of 23 24 residents of this state and the nation, for example, the 25 tobacco settlement.

On behalf of the membership of the WSMA, I'm here this evening to offer brief testimony in the opposition to the conversion of Premera from a not-for-profit to a for-profit insurance company, and to ask you, as regulators, to substantially slow the process of investigation so that organizations such as ours can have the opportunity to more carefully review the proposed conversion.

At our recent annual meeting in Tacoma, the association's house of delegates unanimously adopted a resolution to oppose the Premera conversion. Our house of delegates is composed of physicians from every county and virtually every medical specialty society. Its members practice in every type of practice from academia to large group practices to small group practices.

I offer this because it is significant that a resolution of such importance as this should pass without a single dissenting vote. I and other physician leaders of the WSMA have been told in no uncertain terms that the proposed conversion is a serious concern to our members. If Premera converts to an investor-owned for-profit status, physicians across the state fear that the company's attentions will turn from concern for its subscribers and network of physicians and hospitals to increasing the financial returns of the company's

shareholders.

Management asserts that the best way to do so is to do this, is through an offering of a price-competitive product that meets consumer needs, in which a satisfied viable network of suppliers such as physicians and hospitals work. However, as management's interests turn to increasing profit, our members are certain that it will come at the expense of Premera's participating physicians and hospitals, which are all struggling at this time.

The physician community needs answers to many questions which cannot be addressed in a hurried fashion. Here are some of our concerns. In areas of Washington State where Premera is functionally a single payer, such as in areas of Eastern Washington, what impact will this conversion have on the market and the physician and hospital network?

Our members feel it will be negative, and that they can expect reduced fees for their services, or worse yet, that the company, and again, in need to satisfy its new stockholders, will leave the market where it cannot realize a sufficient return on investment.

What is exactly the thinking of management on why it needs to convert to a for-profit status? Exactly how threatened is the plan? To what use will the newfound

capital be put? Is Premera positioning itself to be an acquisition target by such large multistate insurers as Well Point or Anthem? If shareholder value would be increased through such a sale, how could Premera not sell, despite what corporate leaders may say at this time? Will more attention be paid by management to growing the company to make it more attractive for acquisition than to attending to the needs of subscribers and the network in our state? As for -- as a for-profit company, will subsequent stock offerings be used to enrich senior management?

Finally, we ask both the Commissioner's and Attorney General's Office to ensure, should you be inclined to grant this conversion request, that the assets of Premera be preserved in a similar not-for-profit organization or foundation supporting the health of the community.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify this evening.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you, Doctor.

Since you touched on it, and Mr. Odiorne also did, let me just reiterate that no decision will be made until we have all of the information that we need in order to make that decision. We initially outlined a fairly aggressive time schedule as to the process that we would go through.

That was before Premera waived the 60-day requirement that we were operating under, which was the case where, once filing was completed with our offices, we had 60 days; so we outlined a schedule to fill that. They have waived it. In no small part, it would have been difficult to have collected sufficient information. Without sufficient information, it would have been difficult to approve any filing without all of the information we needed to make that decision.

So there is ample time, and this is a process that will not be rushed unduly, and only that we have the sufficient information available to us so that, at the time that a decision is made, to make a decision. I just reassure you that it will not be rushed. You will have plenty of time to offer considerably more comment as to the process that we're involved in.

MR. ISAACS: Thank you for those assurances.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you.

Betty Horton?

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$ HORTON: Actually most of the information that I was going to present (inaudible).

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much.

Betty Horton has indicated that the comments that she was going to offer have already been presented and passes on the opportunity to speak tonight.

I'm not positive here. Is it S. Merkley?

DR. MERKLEY: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is David Merkley, M-e-r-k-l-e-y. I am a physician practicing here in Richland, and I do not have a prepared statement, but I do have some concerns.

The ingredients for the healthcare pie are provided by employers and individuals who pay into an insurance pool. The insurance company then divides that pie between the administrative costs and the medical costs provided to those who are insured. I find it difficult to see how you can include payment to a for-profit investor without making the slice of the pie going to medical care smaller.

I also think that I have not seen the 20-percent increase in the payments that I have received from Premera over the last several years, let alone the last year. I think that this is an organization that is large enough and will have a large enough effect on the state of healthcare in our community and in the state that most careful consideration needs to be given to this.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much,
Doctor.

Let's see. Michael Cafferky? Hopefully I'm close on that.

1 MR. CAFFERKY: You got it exactly right, one of 2 the few people. Thank you.

My name is Michael Cafferky. It's spelled

C-a-f-f-e-r-k-y. I don't have a prewritten statement.

Just a few thoughts, however. I'm the interim

administrator at Quincy Valley Medical Center in Central

Washington, and so my thoughts have to do with the

employees that I deal with there and the patients in our

small community.

I hope you'll forgive me for citing a recent insurance event that occurred in our organization's life, which you may have heard about, where our professional liability insurance carrier came to us two weeks before the end of the premium year and announced to us that they would be raising our rates 385 percent. That would make our annual costs go from \$139,000 up to \$660,000. With that kind of a cost increase, we would have to go out of business, basically.

Now, we pay quite a bit more for health insurance for our employees, and I'm sure that the individuals who are representing the interest's change from nonprofit to profit aren't envisioning those kinds of triple-digit increases for annual premiums. I hope they're not. I'm sure they're not.

I do respect the kind of juggling act that the

health insurance companies have before them to try to create a benefit plan that adds value to the customer, provides a certain level of coverage. It doesn't cover everything that is demanded by customers, so there is a real challenge there.

So my concerns have to do with the potential inherent conflict between the profit and the care. And I do have concerns about the for-profit status of an organization, and the drives to creating investor dividends, and the care of the individuals at the other end of the equation.

I also hope that the executives of the organization will not have personal benefits as a result of this. I don't know all the details on that, but I hope that receives very close scrutiny.

We do live in a society with fixed financial resources for healthcare, and yet greater and greater demands for care on the system. And I realize that this one insurance company can't solve the social ills that we all experience, but I just urge the commission and those involved, all the stakeholders, and those reviewing this situation, to proceed very cautiously.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much,

Mr. Cafferky.

John Putz, wish to testify now or...?

MR. PUTZ: Sure.

My name is John Putz, P-u-t-z, and I'm very nervous because I was not prepared to do this. But in sitting back and listening to the comments, there are some observations that I guess I would like to just express from a personal provider of services to small employers in Eastern Washington.

It's been my observation since the healthcare crisis, as I define it, began -- started back in House Bill 1046, which basically determined and changed the way in which medical care premiums were delivered to the employees in this state. And it changed it from being a community-rated pool to being an age-rated pool.

And my concern resides with the -- what's happening in Eastern Washington and what happens is its going from a nonprofit to a for-profit. You look at profitable markets, and being in Eastern Washington, we are an older, smaller population part of the state. The Cascades do divide us into two different entities.

Many of my clients reside in the -- own small businesses, and it is not uncommon to see a business of five or six or ten employees with an average age of 50 or plus. With this age-rated basis, it does created an extremely high burden on these people.

And just reflecting on the same comments of 50- to 60-percent increases, I'm not sure if they're talking about company increases or individual increases. It doesn't really matter. But I have seen double digit increases in the last three or four years, and I see no relief for that in sight.

Now, whether that has made Eastern Washington more profitable or not, I don't know. But being an ex-banker, when you're operating in a nonprofitable market, you sometimes tend to not want to continue to operate in that market.

And I would just hope that through this whole review process -- I'm not saying that privatization or for-profit is a bad thing or whether it's a good thing.

I just would like to emphasize that I think the whole system needs to be looked at, not just were whether Premera Blue Cross becomes a for-profit.

But I think we have some inherent problems in the state in the delivery of healthcare and how we price that product. So all I guess I would emphasize is that your review be cautious and be responsible to those who you serve.

That's it. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: Thank you very much,

25 Mr. Putz.

Let me reassure you and others that the principal reason that we are out here hearing from consumers early in the process is because we want to make absolutely certain as we go through this process that we've heard from individuals. And the most significant barrier or challenge that we face as the part of the decision-making process is that consumers are not harmed in this process. So that will be a major part of what we're considering.

You also touched, Mr. Putz, on a another issue which is of significant importance to Eastern Washington, which is why we are fully holding half of our hearings in Eastern Washington as opposed to Western Washington.

Eastern Washington has a significantly higher stake in this conversion as opposed to Western Washington because of the very significant presence of Premera Blue Cross in Eastern Washington.

My colleague in Alaska, who is the insurance commissioner, Bob Lohr, reminds me constantly about the situation that Alaska's in, which is a high dependence on Premera. And I point out to him, well, in Western Washington, you're right; it's different down here in Washington. But in Eastern Washington, it's much like Alaska.

So there is a significant issue involved here which is why we're out here wanting to hear from individuals.

Page 48

As I mentioned earlier, this is the third of four forums that we are hosting around the state. And the transcript will be posted on our Web site as soon as it is possible to do that. And I would anticipate in a week's time that it's likely we will have it posted on our Web site.

As we gather more information, there will be additional opportunities, as I pointed out, for comment. We anticipate another round of public hearings when additional information is available. Go to our Web site, which is www.insurance.wa.gov, and you'll have an opportunity to view these documents and developments as they take place. And you also have an opportunity, if you would like to, to comment electronically by sending an email with your comments. It will become a part of the official record.

Again thank you so much for coming out tonight and -- how did I miss -- I offer my apologies for somebody who traveled from the west side. And, you know, what happened is I marked your name and jumped immediately to the next one.

Let me ask the executive director of the Washington State Hospital Association, Mr. Leo Greenawalt, to come forward to offer his comments.

DR. GREENAWALT: First, my name is Leo Greenawalt, G-r-e-e-n-a-w-a-l-t.

First, let me tell you how encouraged we were to hear of the time frame change. We understood that it was a 60-day period with 30 days added on. And to hear that you're going to go through slowly and look at this issue is really encouraging to us.

The hospitals have been able to react to this only from a fear perspective because we don't have a lot of information, and we have been very much anticipating the studies that are done and the time to look at it and make sure we understand it.

I want it talk a little bit about the history of Blue Cross. It was formed in the State of Washington coming out of the Depression. There were a number of for-profit hospitals in the state and a number of not-for-profit hospitals, and almost everyone coming into the middle of the Depression were close to bankruptcy.

The hospitals then formed this company, Blue Cross, as a way of keeping healthcare available across, well, mostly in the western side originally, but similar things in the middle part. Interestingly, every for-profit hospital went bankrupt and out of business during that period of time, and a few community hospitals remained. And the purpose of Blue Cross in this state, as well as in other states across the country, was to preserve some kind of access to care because people couldn't pay for

it. There was no system put in place.

This was pretty much preserved in the 1970s in our state when the State passed a rate-setting commission bill. And the purpose of that was, for the rural areas mostly, was to make sure that when Medicare and Medicaid didn't pay their share of the hospital bill, that the private market would pick up the cost shift. And so our state institutionalized.

It was, from a rural perspective, it was the most protective thing that could have happened. We would have lost most of our hospitals during that period, but the not-for-profit institutions out there paid more than their share of the costs and kept them alive. It was an understood and committed-to process.

We decided in the late '80s that competition was the way to go. It was mostly an urban phenomenon that did something about. And we found the rural hospitals deteriorating during that time. In fact, just this last year, of about 45 rural hospitals in the state, 22 have been designated as critical-access hospitals. What that means is that the federal government -- and we have a similar law in the state -- has looked at these hospitals and said, "You're the only thing available out there, and if you go out of business there won't be anything for the public." And also found that they were hurting so bad

Page 51

financially that, if they didn't put some more money in, both on the federal Medicare level and the state level, they were going to go under.

The most worrisome part of all of this hearing and discussion is the word "market" when we talk about healthcare insurance. There may well be a market in the cities. There is no market in rural America. Nobody wants to go in. There's not even a market for hospital care. It's either there or they're not.

There may be ways of answering this. If there was built-in subsidies in the '70s that covered rural health care, maybe there are ways for the Insurance Commissioner and Attorney General to come up with ways to guarantee that the insurance companies stay in the rural areas and pay the costs to keep them going. So maybe there are elements of our fears that can be allayed on that. But it's a huge issue.

What I've gotten is more phone calls on this issue than any I've had since I've been CEO of the Hospital Association, and it is all in fear: What is going to happen to us if they come out of the rural areas? They know the state budget is in shambles, and it's going to be that way for a couple years. They expect tremendous cutbacks that way.

They're worried if Blue Cross Premera starts acting

Page 52 more like an investor-owned company and worries about 1 profit and doesn't worry about protecting the rural access to what's out there, that they'll just go under 3 and there's nothing left afterward. So we appreciate your taking time on this. We can't 5 wait to hear what kind of studies are done so we can look 6 at them as well, and we hope to participate in a rational 7 8 way, not just saying no to everything. But at this moment, all we heard are bad stories from other states, 10 and it just builds up across our state. 11 Thank you. 12 COMMISSIONER KREIDLER: And thank you very much, Leo. Again, my apologies. Taking too many notes, 13 14 not paying attention as I call people up. 15 Is there anybody else I may have overlooked? don't think so. 16 17 Again, on behalf of the Attorney General and myself as the Insurance Commissioner of the State of Washington, 18 19 let me expression my appreciation for your coming out tonight and participating in this process. It was most 20 21 helpful. We look forward to having an opportunity to 22 hear from you again. Thank you so much for coming. 23 (Proceedings concluded at 8:18 p.m.) 24

25

	Page 53
1	CERTIFICATE
2	I, SUE E. GARCIA, a duly authorized Court Reporter and
3	Notary Public in and for the State of Washington, residing at
4	Tacoma, do hereby certify:
5	That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me on
6	the 8th of October, 2002, and thereafter transcribed by me by
7	means of computer-aided transcription, that the transcript is a
8	full, true, and complete transcript of said proceedings;
9	That I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or
10	counsel of any party to this action or relative or employee of
11	any such attorney or counsel, and I am not financially
12	interested in the said action or the outcome thereof;
13	IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and
14	affixed my official seal this October 14, 2002.
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
	
23	SUE E. GARCIA, CCR, RPR
	GA-RC-IS-E305QB
24	
25	